

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. In this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 13 and 16 have been amended, new claims 31-38 have been added, and claims 3, 11-12, 15, 23-26, and 29-30 have been canceled. Claims 2 and 27-28 were canceled previously. Claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22 and 31-38 remain pending.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks Examiner Bonshock for his time and helpful suggestions during the telephonic interview with Applicant's undersigned representative on August 31, 2007. Applicant's representative discussed the differences between claim 1 and the cited art and discussed possible claim amendments, including the possible incorporation of subject matter from claim 3 into claim 1. It was agreed that Applicant would file an RCE and amend the independent claims to more clearly distinguish over the cited references by more explicitly describing to do items and categories. An Interview Summary was mailed by the Office on September 6, 2007.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Final Office Action, claims 23-26 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherr et al., Pub. No. US 2004/0010513 A1, hereinafter Scherr. Claims 23-26 and 29-30 have been canceled, so this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherr and Zawadzki et al., Patent No. 7,107,268, hereinafter Zawadzki. Claims 3, 11-12 and 15 have been canceled, so this rejection is now moot with respect to those

claims. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 in accordance with the discussion during the telephonic interview on August 31, 2007, and Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, overcome the rejection under § 103(a) of claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-22.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method that is patentable over the combination of Scherr and Zawadzki for at least the reason that the references fail to teach or suggest “displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select ... wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template and a document ... displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list; and ... providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list” as now set forth in claim 1.

Amended independent claim 13 is directed to a system that is patentable over the combination of Scherr and Zawadzki for at least the reason that the references fail to teach or suggest “presenting a plurality of categories of entities on the display ... wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template and a document ... displaying alternative choices of entities on the display from which a user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list; and ... providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list” as now set forth in claim 13.

New independent claim 31 is directed to a memory medium that is also patentable over the combination of Scherr and Zawadzki for at least the reason that the references fail to teach or suggest “displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select ...

wherein the plurality of categories of entities includes at least one member of a group comprising a Web link, a task, a template and a document ... displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with the single to do item selected from the list; and ... providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the single to do item selected from the list” as set forth in claim 31.

Furthermore, dependent claims 3-12, 15-22 and 32-38 are patentable over the art of record. Claims 4-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 1. Claims 16-22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 13 and are patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 13. Claims 32-38 depend directly or indirectly from claim 31 and are patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 31.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22 and 31-38 are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1, 4-10, 13, 16-22 and 31-38. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required (or to credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Lujin/

Patrick A. Lujin
Reg. No. 35,260

PAL/ms
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550